

## REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### *Status of the Claims*

Claims 1-10, 12-20, 22-25, 27-53, and 55-75 are pending. Claims 1, 22, 35, 46, 55, 63, 72, and 73 are independent. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22-25, 27, 30-39, 42-47, 49, 50, 55, 56, 58, 62-64, 66, 70 and 71 have been amended herein. New claims 72-75 have been added. No new matter has been added.

The amendments to the preamble of Claim 1 reciting the concept of rhythmic editing are supported at least by page 6, line 17 through page 7, line 1, and page 10, line 24 through page 12, line 15 of the specification.

Support for the inputting step added Claim 1 is found at least at page 8, lines 7 -14 of the specification.

Support for the additions to the two processing steps including the identification of output segments and discardable portions of predetermined durations is found at least at page 11, line 18 through page 14, line 6; page 16, lines 13-17; pages 23-26; and page 27, line 12 through page 29, line 21 of the specification.

New Claim 72 represents a combination of features found in Claims 1-3 and is therefore supported at least by Claims 1-3. New Claim 73 is a variation upon amended claim 1, and corresponds, but is not limited to, the Quick-Look template described at pages 23 to 26 of the specification. New Claim 74 recites a compression feature supported at least at page 24, lines 11

and 12 of the specification. New Claim 75 is supported at least at page 17, line 15, page 21, line 14, and page 24, lines 8-12 of the specification.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that Claims 3, 4, 8, 10, 14, 15, 24, 25, 28, 29, 38, 40 and 41 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. In response, as noted above, new Claim 72 is a redrafting of Claim 3 in independent form. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Claim 72 be allowed. As to the other allowable dependent claims, these claims have not been redrafted in independent form because the independent claims from which these dependent claims depend are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed below.

*Telephone Conversation With Examiner*

Applicants gratefully acknowledge two informal telephone conversations between the Examiner and the undersigned. In those conversations, the Examiner indicated that amendments to the independent claims as has been done to Claim 1 in this Amendment would likely overcome the outstanding rejections for the reasons discussed below.

*Rejections*

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, 12, 13, 16-18, 22, 23, 27, 30-33, 39, 42-44 and 71 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ohmori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,620). Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmori et al. in view of Nakatani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,784,521). Claims 20, 34, 45-48, 55-57, and 63-65 have been

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmori et al. in view of Nakatani et al. and Yaegashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,453). Claims 36 and 37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmori et al. Claims 49, 50, 58, 59, 66 and 67 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmori et al. in view of Nakatani et al., Yaegashi et al., and Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 5,515,101). Claims 51-53, 60-62 and 68-70 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohmori et al. in view of Nakatani et al., Yaegashi et al., Yoshida, and Miyazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,187).

#### *Response to Rejections*

In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejections, independent Claims 1, 22, 35, 46, 55, and 63 have been amended. Applicants submit that as amended, these claims are allowable for the following reasons.

Independent Claim 1 relates to a computer-implementable method of editing a video sequence comprising at least one clip, each clip being formed at least by video content captured between two points in time and thereby defining a duration of the clip. The method comprises the steps of extracting duration data associated with the duration of each clip of the video sequence, processing the duration data of the at least one to form editing instruction data configured to define output segments from the at least one clip, and processing the at least one clip of the video sequence according to the editing instruction data to form an output edited sequence.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the method is a method of rhythmically editing an input video sequence to form an output edited sequence of shorter duration than the input video sequence without requiring a user to manually edit the input video sequence. Thus, the invention can automatically edit raw video footage so as to absolve an amateur (domestic) user from prior

art (complex) editing tasks. In contrast, Ohmori clearly describes a prior art manual editing system.

Claim 1 has also been amended to recite the step of inputting the input video sequence into a computer to implement the method. Claim 1 has been further amended to recite that the duration-data processing step processes the duration data of the at least one input clip according to editing rules to form editing instruction data, the editing instruction data being configured to define output segments from the at least one input clip of the input video sequence. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the editing rules indicate a sequence of the output segments and a plurality of predetermined segment durations including a first duration and a second duration.

In contrast, the Ohmori patent, being a manual system requiring the user to edit video clips manually, is not understood to disclose or suggest the extracting of duration data associated with the duration of each clip of the video sequence, as recited by amended Claim 1.

In addition, the Ohmori patent is not understood to disclose or suggest the processing of the extracted duration data according to editing rules, to form editing instruction data configured to define output segments from the at least one input clip, indicating a sequence of the output segments and a plurality of predetermined segment durations including a first duration and a second duration, as also recited by amended Claim 1.

Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that this processing step comprises (i) identifying, from the input video sequence, the sequence of the output segments, each of the output segment having one of the predetermined segment durations, and being derived from a single input clip of the input video sequence, and (ii) identifying, from the input video sequence, discardable portions each having at least a predetermined third duration, the discardable portions separating the segments of the rhythmic sequence, there being at least one discardable portion

identified from each input clip of the input video sequence. In contrast, the Ohmori patent is not understood to disclose or suggest any such features.

Finally, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the clip-processing step processes the at least one input clip of the input video sequence according to the editing instruction data to discard the discardable portions and to form the output edited sequence from the sequence of the segments. And since the Ohmori patent discloses a manual editing method, it is not understood to disclose or suggest this clip-processing processing step recited by amended Claim 1.

Since the Ohmori patent is not understood to disclose or suggest, for example, the concepts of processing duration data according to editing rules to form editing instruction data, the editing rules including a plurality of predetermined segment durations including first and second durations of the output segments, and a predetermined third duration for discardable portions, as recited by amended Claim 1, amended Claim 1 is not understood to be anticipated by this patent.

And since the Ohmori patent is not understood to disclose or suggest, for example, the concepts of (i) identifying, from the input video sequence, the sequence of the output segments, each of the output segment having one of the predetermined segment durations, and being derived from a single input clip of the input video sequence, and (ii) identifying, from the input video sequence, discardable portions each having at least a predetermined third duration, the discardable portions separating the segments of the rhythmic sequence, there being at least one discardable portion identified from each input clip of the input video sequence, as recited by amended Claim 1, amended Claim 1 is not understood to be anticipated by this patent for this additional reason.

Viewed from another perspective, the end result of manually editing a video, as shown in the Ohmori patent, is not the same as the automated process of processing duration data according

to editing rules, to form editing instruction data, indicating a plurality of predetermined segment durations including first and section durations and a discardable-portion segment third duration.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn. And since independent Claims 22, 35, 46, 55, and 63 have been amended in a similar manner, they are submitted to be allowable for similar reasons, inasmuch as the citations to Nakatani et al. and Yaegashi et al. are also not understood to disclose or suggest the features noted above or features similar thereto.

As to new independent Claim 72, as noted above, this claim is a redrafting of allowable Claim 3 in independent form. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this claim be allowed.

New Claim 73 is similar to amended Claim 1 in that it contains the same preamble, and the same inputting, extracting, and clip processing steps. Claim 73 also contains a duration data processing step that processes the duration data of the at least one input clip according to editing rules to form editing instruction data. The duration-data processing step of Claim 73 differs from amended Claim 1 in that Claim 73 recites additional and different features not found in Claim 1.

Thus, Claim 73 recites rhythmic editing rules including at least a user selectable reproduction duration for the output edited sequence and a plurality of editing durations including a first duration and a second duration. Claim 73 also recites that the editing instruction data is configured to define output segments from the at least one input clip of the input video sequence. Claim 73 also recites that the processing of the duration data comprises three steps: (i) determining from the reproduction duration at least the first editing duration for defining output segments from the at least one input clip and a number of the output segments of the first editing duration to occupy the reproduction duration; (ii) identifying, from the input video sequence, a

sequence of the number of the output segments, each the output segment being derived from a single input clip of the input video sequence; and (iii) identifying discardable portions from the input video sequence, the discardable portions having at least the second duration and separating the output segments of the rhythmic sequence, there being at least one discardable portion identified from each input clip of the input video sequence.

In contrast, neither the Ohmori patent, nor the other applied art, is understood to disclose or suggest the extracting or the clip processing steps, as recited by Claim 73. In addition, neither the Ohmori patent, nor the other applied art, is understood to disclose or suggest processing the duration data according to rhythmic editing rules, including at least a user selectable reproduction duration for the output edited sequence and a plurality of editing durations including a first duration and a second duration, to form editing instruction data. Further, neither the Ohmori patent, nor the other applied art, is not understood to disclose or suggest that the editing instruction data is configured to define output segments from the at least one input clip of the input video sequence, or that the processing of the duration data comprises the determining and two identifying steps: (i), (ii), and (iii) recited in Claim 73. For these reasons, Claim 73 is also allowable over this patent.

### *Conclusion*

In view of the above amendment and remarks, the application is now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue of the present application is earnestly solicited.

If there is any reason precluding the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Any fee required in connection with this paper should be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1205. Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary M. Jacobs/

---

Gary M. Jacobs  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
GMDlp

FCHS\_WS 160444bv1